

### REMARKS

Claims 1-19 have been previously canceled. Claims 20-39 have been examined. Claims 20, 21, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 37, 38 and 39 are amended herein with claims 26, 27, 36 cancelled. Thus, claims 20 – 25, 28 – 35, 37 – 39 are presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0009], [00015], [00017], [00021], [00043], and [00044]. No new matter has been added.

#### Claim Objections

Claims 21 – 39 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant has addressed such informalities in its amended claims and requests that the objections be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 20 and 25 - 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Applicant has amended the claims to obviate the rejection and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 USC 112 as being incomplete. Applicant has amended the claims to obviate the rejection and requests that the rejection be withdrawn

#### Claim Rejections under Section 103

Claims 20 - 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Gerhardt* (7,376,599) in view of *Purcell* (6,601,043) and official notice. Claims 29 - 31 are rejected as being obvious over *Gerhardt* (7,376,599) in view of *Purcell* (6,601,043) and official notice and further in view of *Walker* (6,249,772). Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Gerhardt* (7,376,599) in view of official notice. Claims 33 - 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Gerhardt* (7,376,599) in view of official notice and

*Walker*. Claims 36 – 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Gerhardt*, *Walker*, and official notice, and further in view of *Purcell*. Claim 39 is rejected as being obvious over *Gerhardt* (7,376,599) in view of *Purcell* (6,601,043) and official notice. Applicant traverses these rejections, including official notice. Based upon the amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the prior art when rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. 103. In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all words in a claim must be considered for judging the patentability of the claim against the prior art.

The independent claims have been amended to more specifically define the unique features of the invention.

For example, each independent claim includes the feature that the displayed results of the search request provides a specific view that identifies which of the displayed results correspond to the spare part client's *own inventory* and inventory of *connected companies* before being purchased.

The Examiner points to *Gerhardt* (7,376,599) for describing display of “own parts”. Specifically, in *Gerhardt* “a single system participant could be both a seller and a buyer. That is, a repair shop may have a surplus of one part that they wish to sell and also have a need to obtain other parts. In this case, one of the columns would represent the system participant's own available inventory. Accordingly, such a system participant would be able to use the system 10 to monitor its own inventory as well as the entire database 22.”

However, this description does not accurately describe or suggest the steps of the present invention as claimed. Specifically, the present invention does not just list “own inventory” in one column and other's inventory in another column as in *Gerhardt*. Rather, the present invention displays the results in a specific view that identifies which of the displayed results correspond to the spare part client's own inventory and wherein the results are arranged in accordance with connected companies. This specialized view allows the client to recognize which of the results correspond to its own or its connected companies' inventory.

Moreover, the independent claims provide for the spare part offers to be defined to be restricted to a specific economic area. The spare part lists are stored in a respective one of a plurality of virtual spare part warehouses restricted by the specific economic area. When

searching the spare part lists in accordance with the search request, the search is conducted in a virtual spare part warehouse of a specific economic area for closed economies or across all virtual spare part warehouses for open economies.

The Examiner points to *Walker* for describing identifying a seller within a buyer's geographic area. However, this description does not accurately describe or suggest the steps of the present invention as claimed. Specifically, in the present invention, the specific economic area where sale of the spare part will be restricted to is defined up front during the input stage. Then, during the search stage, closed economies search only the virtual spare part warehouses for the specific restricted area and open economies search across all warehouses covering all areas. This is not the same or even similar to matching buyers and sellers by geographic region as the restrictions in the present invention are pre-defined, stored in a different manner and structure, and more restrictive.

Applicant submits that none of the remaining cited references, alone or in combination, remedy the shortcomings of *Gerhardt* and *Walker*. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of the independent claims should be withdrawn.

The dependent claims incorporate all of the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter, which makes them independently patentable over the art of record. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims for at least the above-stated reasons.

(Please proceed to the next page.)

Conclusion:

Based on the above argument and the above-noted distinctions, it is urged that the claims are in condition for allowance.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 8, 2011

By: Tina Gonka

Tina Gonka  
Limited Recognition No. L0623  
(407) 736-4005

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830